

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION

X CORP

Plaintiff,

v.

MEDIA MATTERS FOR AMERICA,
ET AL.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 4:23-CV-01175-O

ORDER

Before the Court are ten documents provided to the Court by Defendants for *in camera* review, which were requested in Plaintiff's Motion to Compel.¹ See Jan 3, 2025, Order 8, ECF No. 136; Pl.'s Mot. to Compel, ECF No. 95. The Court deferred ruling on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel until after an *in camera* review because Plaintiff argued that the withheld documents may be "relevant because [they] show[] inconsistency between Defendants' reporting on other subjects and the malicious conduct in this case."²

Having reviewed the documents, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion to Compel. ECF No. 95. Plaintiff cannot satisfy the two disputed requirements for disclosure. TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 22.024(5)–(6). Specifically, Plaintiff's Motion to Compel is denied because the documents are "peripheral, nonessential, or speculative" and are not "relevant and material." *Id.*

SO ORDERED on this **1st** day of **April, 2025**.


Reed O'Connor
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The ten documents that the Court requested production of are: MMFA_013561, MMFA_013698, MMFA_013699, MMFA_013715, MMFA_013756, MMFA_013762, MMFA_013763, MMFA_013765, MMFA_013767, and MMFA_013777.

² Pl.'s Br. in Supp. Mot. to Compel. 10, ECF No. 96.